NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
PROPRIETOR.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.—On and after January 1, 1875, the daily and weekly editions of the NEW YORK HERALD will be sent free of postage.

THE DAILY HERALD, *published every day in the year.* Four cents per copy. Annual subscription price $12.

All business or news letters and telegraphic despatches must be addressed NEW YORK HERALD.

Rejected communications will not be returned.

Letters and packages should be properly sealed.

LONDON OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK HERALD—NO. 46 FLEET STREET.
PARIS OFFICE—RUE SCRIBE.

Subscriptions and advertisements will be received and forwarded on the same terms as in New York.

VOLUME XL.....NO. 133

AMUSEMENTS TO-NIGHT.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART, West Fourteenth street.—Open from 10 A. M. to 5 P. M.

OLYMPIC THEATRE, No. 624 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE, Twenty-eighth street and Broadway.—Combination matinee at 1:30 P. M. THE BIG BONANZA, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M.

BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE, Fulton avenue.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

METROPOLITAN THEATRE, No. 585 Broadway.—FEMALE BATHERS, at 8 P. M.

ROBINSON HALL, West Sixteenth street.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.

BOOTH'S THEATRE, corner of Twenty-third street and Sixth avenue.—EVADNE, at 8 P. M.; closes at 11 P. M. Miss Clara Morris.

LYCEUM THEATRE, Fourteenth street, near Sixth avenue.—LA PERICHOLE, at 8 P. M. Mlle. Aimee.

SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS, Broadway, corner of Twenty-ninth street.—NEGRO MINSTRELSY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M.

BROOKLYN THEATRE, THE TWO ORPHANS, at 8 P. M. Misses Minnie and Lillian Conway.

WALLACK'S THEATRE, Broadway.—THE IRISH HEIRESS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:50 P. M. Miss Ada Dyas, Mr. Montague.

BOWERY OPERA HOUSE, No. 201 Bowery.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

WOOD'S MUSEUM, Broadway, corner of Thirtieth street.—MAZEPPA, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

GERMANIA THEATRE, Fourteenth street.—SOUBRETTENSTREICHE, at 8 P. M.

GREAT SOUTH AMERICAN CIRCUS, Houston street, East River.—Performance at 2 and 7:30 P. M.

THEATRE COMIQUE, No. 514 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

TRIPLE SHEET.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1875.

From our reports this morning the probabilities are that the weather to-day will be clear and cool, the temperature rising later in the day.

WALL STREET YESTERDAY.—Stocks were feverish and unsettled. Gold ended at 115⅝. Money was easy and foreign exchange dull.

THE wounded mutineers of the Jefferson Borden are recovering and will soon be returned to the United States.

TAMMANY HALL, by its failure to give us rapid transit, has shown itself unfit to lead the destinies of a great party.

THE NEWARK DETECTIVES have succeeded in arresting a person charged with murder. This startling achievement should not be lost upon our detectives in New York.

THE Senators from New York remained silent when the amendment to exempt Fourth avenue from the provisions of the Rapid Transit bill were passed. Has it not been written that silence is golden?

THE TAMMANY SOCIETY installed the newly elected sachems last evening. If these sachems would only stop their pranks and Indian nonsense and give us rapid transit they would do something worthy of Tammany in its old days. John Kelly's place is in Albany looking after the Tammany Senators, and not walking around a room in Fourteenth street in Indian fashion.

THE SAFETY OF THE METROPOLIS.—The announcement that the steamer Metropolis, running from Bermuda to New York, has at last come safely to port, will be a gratification to many who had almost given up all hope. The story of her adventures will be found in our despatches. From her reports the accident which befell her was one over which her officers could have no control. The weather which she encountered was of an unusually severe and distressing character, and the fact that she came well out of her perils is a matter for congratulation and thanks.

GERMANY PROCLAIMS PEACE.—The German government evidently feels it owes something to public opinion, and that the general sentiment of the world resents the policy of blood and iron. Consequently the official organ of Bismarck announces that the relations between Germany and France have not been as friendly as they are now since the close of the war. A semi-official newspaper adds that Germany desires peace, and feels that she can rely on Russia to preserve it. We trust these assurances will not be unfounded. Europe has had enough of "blood and iron" for this generation. If this is the result of the Czar's visit it will place the world under obligations to His Majesty.

IT IS SUGGESTIVE to read among the list of those who voted for the amendment of Senator Wagner, of Wagner's Car Company, exempting Fourth avenue from the provisions of the Common Council Rapid Transit bill, the names of Fox, Ledwith and Moore. These Senators were all among the Pretorian guards of the old Tweed empire, and this same Fourth avenue, whose interest they so gladly served, is that for which the taxpayers of New York have paid already four million dollars to improve for the benefit of large railway corporations.

The Memoirs of Sherman—Who Conquered the Rebellion?—Was It Sherman or Grant?

The review we elsewhere print of the second volume of Sherman's "Memoirs" will give our readers an idea of the exact value of this recent and remarkable contribution to the history of the war. It is almost too soon for us to think of history in connection with our tremendous strife. The echoes of the war have hardly died away. All the passions still live. There are hundreds of thousands North and South to whom the war is still a remembrance of woe and deep personal sorrow. It is too soon for us to estimate the exact stature of the men who conducted the war or the statesmen who controlled its policy. One solemn figure stands out from the others, with a fame already as mystical and enduring as that of Washington. But it may be well asked, How stainless would the fame of Lincoln be had he lived to attempt reconstruction, and had he not died with some of the glories of martyrdom? Lincoln and Lee and Stonewall Jackson—with, perhaps, John Brown—are the figures that have attracted the world's widest sympathy and attention. General Grant's position must be decided by the next generation. Whether he is a great or simply a successful soldier, whether he has the highest military genius, whether his victories came from strategy and knowledge of war, or from mere attrition, the larger force rubbing against the smaller and in time grinding it into powder, are questions we cannot answer now. General Grant has a relation toward us of too immediate a character for us to weigh him fairly. His friends overrate and his enemies underrate his merit. We shall have to wait a generation before we can decide between the estimate of enemies or friends.

General Sherman is regarded as the greatest soldier of our war by foreign critics, or, rather, he shares that honor with Lee. At home his reputation is steadily growing. The country has been wayward in its treatment of him. At first he was suspected of disloyalty, because he did not take extreme views on the slavery question. Then he was regarded as a crazy man, because he insisted upon an army to hold Kentucky. Then the country became rapturously in love with him, because of the capture of Atlanta and the march to the sea. Then came another frenzy of anger and suspicion and intimations that he might sell out to Jefferson Davis, because he made a truce with Joseph E. Johnston on the basis of his conversations with Mr. Lincoln. When the war ended we came to look upon Sherman as an interesting, slightly eccentric, brilliant man, who wrote well and made good speeches, with executive qualities, and who, during the war, was the brilliant exponent of the sounder views of the wise and silent Grant. Some interest has been attracted to his opinions and character by the belief that he has become soured with Washington, the Cabinet and General Grant. There has been an idea that perhaps he would be an available candidate for the Presidency on the conservative ticket. He has had difficulties with the War Department, the Secretary of which was one of his colonels in the Atlanta campaign. His retirement to St. Louis is understood to have been a desire to withdraw from the malarial social and political influences of Washington. All this time his fame has been growing. He has not been made responsible for the misfortunes and errors of the administration. He has none of the burdens of politics. Party acrimony has spared him. In the meantime the public opinion of foreign nations has been throwing a new lustre upon his name. With all of our independence of thought we are keenly alive to the judgment of other nations. Since the war foreign critics have been steadily advancing him to the first place in the roll of generals. His Atlanta campaign and his march to the sea are regarded as among the finest conceptions in modern military history.

The question has often been asked, How far does the merit of these movements belong to General Sherman? Was the march to the sea his own conception or that of Grant? The opinion has been steadily fostered that General Grant conceived the daring plan of swinging loose from Atlanta and marching to the seacoast; that he gave his ideas to General Sherman at Cincinnati, and that Sherman in time elaborated them into the brilliant result which followed. In the adulation with which we are apt to surround success this opinion has taken root, and the friends of Grant have sturdily contended that there was no ground for the extreme praise bestowed by foreigners upon Sherman; that the true honor, after all, belonged to the silent Ulysses. It is undoubtedly this opinion that has led General Sherman to print during his own life his memoirs of the war. In doing so he follows illustrious examples. Cæsar's Commentaries on his wars are a military classic. Frederick the Great wrote about his campaigns. Napoleon dictated to Las Casas and Montholon the military and political history of his life. General Scott reduced his experiences into a book, which has long since been forgotten. There have been a multitude of books on our war, controversial, narrative, historical; for we are a writing and a reading people. But General Sherman is the only one of the great generals of our war who has felt called upon to be his own historian, and in reading his work we cannot deny that he could not have done better. He writes in an irregular, at times careless and rushing, but, in most cases, a brilliant and clear style. Sherman's character stands out in every sentence, and it is the character of a man gentle, brave, firm and frank, who has much to say about himself and other people and means to say it. His judgments of his colleagues and antagonists are frankly expressed. He does not value Hooker's courage or genius. He thinks Logan and Blair were "political" generals, brave enough, but fighting for advancement. He concedes great merit to Thomas, but thinks he was slow. McClellan made a fatal mistake in not going into camp and studying his army instead of remaining in the unhealthy luxury of Washington. He esteems Joseph E. Johnston, but actually thinks Jefferson Davis capable of having planned Lincoln's assassination. His opinion of Mr. Stanton is severe and decisive, going so far as to intimate that he was a party to a fraud upon the Treasury by removing the marks from some captured cotton. The courage of expressing these opinions now no one will question, no matter what we may think of the wisdom. They will certainly lead to discussion and acrimony. No harm will result in the main for us. It is better, after all, that the truth be known. General Sherman had much better say what he thinks now, when the men he criticises can answer him, than to leave it for fifty years, until all the parties are dead and the truth beyond discovery.

This work decides who planned the march to the sea, the capture of Savannah and the fall of Richmond. Incontestably the honor belongs to Sherman. When his mind was revolving around the idea Grant himself was really at a loss to know what to do with Sherman's army, and had some vague notion that it should raid around Georgia and find Hood Even when Sherman developed his plan Grant still thought he should first destroy Hood. But finally Sherman had his own way, and was allowed to plunge into Georgia, making for Savannah, and keeping in view the alternative of Pensacola. The capture of Savannah was Sherman's idea. When his army reached the seacoast Grant sent him orders to park his artillery and come with the main body of his troops to Richmond, leaving Savannah in the hands of the enemy. Evidently Grant did not even then wish to risk a blow at Lee until he had every man he could find. This Sherman opposed, showing that the true way to attack Lee was to march along the coast, and that the capture of Savannah would be a material blow at the rebellion, only second in value to the capture of Richmond. If, as military critics now generally concede, these two achievements, the march to the sea and the capture of Savannah, were the most brilliant achievements of the war, the honor of conceiving them belongs to Sherman, and in awarding him that honor how can we deny him a large if not the largest share of the merit of capturing Richmond? General Sherman in his work expressly says that when he swung away from Atlanta his objective point was Richmond. In advancing this claim now he presents a unique and most interesting question, Who captured Richmond and forced the surrender of Lee? The honor and the credit have generally belonged to Grant, but it is easy to see that General Sherman feels that he, too, largely if not decisively aided in that result, and that if he had not crushed the resources of the Confederacy by the march to the sea Lee might have been able to have escaped from Grant and made a long and irritating war in the cotton States.

Comptroller Green Called to Order.

Governor Tilden does not seem indisposed to administer a rap over the knuckles to Comptroller Green in his Message on city charters. Mr. Green has had an impudent lobby force at Albany all the session, introducing and working through the Senate bill after bill, tinkering the city charter so as to give him power and patronage not belonging to his office. The Governor, in alluding to such jobs, says:—"At the present session various propositions have been introduced and others have been suggested for changing the powers and patronage of the city government. None of them have come before me for official action. No comprehensive or well considered system has been proposed. Hasty and partial changes by laws which, however plausible on their face, cannot be judged of except through an acquaintance with the whole mass of preceding legislation upon which they operate, and likely to produce results not foreseen by their authors, were not desirable."

The Governor also gives Mr. Green an unmistakable hint that his assaults upon other heads of departments and his abusive conduct toward his associates on the Board of Apportionment are out of place. He alludes to the power to levy taxes, spend money and contract debt, invested by the charter in the hands of "the Mayor, Comptroller, Commissioner of Public Works and the President of the Department of Taxes." The Governor, no doubt, refers to the Board of Apportionment, and erroneously places the Commissioner of Public Works on that Board instead of the President of the Board of Aldermen. But in mentioning these officials he takes the occasion to say:—"In the hands of every one of the present incumbents we have the satisfaction to believe that the interests of the people are perfectly secure." This is clearly intended as a rebuke to Comptroller Green, and as a reminder to him that his associates on the Board are, in the opinion of the Governor, just as honest as Mr. Green himself and just as deserving of respect. We may, perhaps, attribute this quiet reproof of the action of the Comptroller to the influence of Mr. John Kelly and other prominent Tammany leaders, who have recently urged upon the Governor the necessity, in his own interest, of checking Mr. Green's insolence and insubordination.

The State Census.

Secretary Willers has written a letter, printed in our news columns, inviting the volunteer assistance of citizens in securing fulness and accuracy of the population returns for this city in the census about to be taken. The reason of this request is the failure of the State Census law to provide a compensation for supervising officers. The only persons the Secretary of State is authorized to pay are the enumerators appointed for each election district. If they should be slack or negligent or inefficient there is no immediate superior to hold them to the performance of their duty and insure thoroughness. The Secretary can appoint supervising agents, but has the disposal of no funds to pay them. He, therefore, offers to appoint suitable men of standing and leisure who may be willing to look after and assist the enumerators from public spirit and to serve without compensation. The community will approve of the suggestion, but the difficulty lies in finding a sufficient number of volunteers.

Everybody recollects the complaints and invective with which the State census of 1865 was assailed by the democratic party. "Depew's census," as it was called, was held up to unmeasured scorn. Secretary Depew probably did the best he could with the imperfect machinery the law allowed him. But as he happened to be a republican, and as the returned population of the city fell short of public expectation, it was fiercely charged that the census had been made purposely inexact in order to diminish the political weight of this democratic part of the State. The decennial State census is the basis of apportionment for Senators and members of Assembly for the ensuing ten years, and if the population of the city is not fully returned there is a corresponding diminution of its representation in the Legislature. If this should happen in 1875, as it doubtless did in 1865, it cannot be ascribed to party motives, inasmuch as Secretary Willers is a democrat. But it is quite possible that this year's census may be as imperfect and unsatisfactory as that of ten years ago, and from precisely the same cause. It is to be hoped that Mr. Willers may be able to supplement the imperfection of the legal provision with the services of unpaid volunteer agents, so that the enumeration of the city may be, as far as practicable, complete.

The Success of Corruption.

We believe no citizen of New York outside of the insane asylum will doubt that the action of the Legislature in Albany on the question of rapid transit was prompted by deliberate corruption. We have been told ever since this question was brought before the Legislature that the lobby had been organized so strongly that rapid transit could not pass; that money had been sent to Albany by various combinations to defeat any measure, or, if one should pass, to strangle it in the future by some hidden clause that would make it unconstitutional. We have never underrated this danger; but our hope was that the parties in power—Governor Tilden, Mayor Wickham and Mr. Kelly—would by the force of their superior influence compel the Legislature, in spite of the lobby, to grant this needed reform. It now seems that the railroad men are stronger than the democratic party. Rapid transit has been struck a fatal blow. There is a hope that it may still be saved, but we have little confidence in it. Men who should have done this must answer to the people for their vote. They must explain the reasons that led them to take upon themselves the responsibility of denying to New York the measure so absolutely necessary to its existence. They come back to their constituents with every presumption in favor of their having criminally sold out the city of New York to corrupt and selfish interests. We do not say, because we do not know, that every man who voted against rapid transit received money for his vote, but it would be a safe thing for the people to regard them as having been openly purchased like cattle in the shambles until they prove the contrary.

There can be no explanation of these votes upon any other theory than that of absolute and shameless corruption. Here was a measure demanded by the general voice of the people; all the statistics went to show that for ten years New York had been receding in the march of metropolitan greatness, while the cities around it have been advancing with tenfold rapidity. It was shown that the future growth of New York had been diverted into other cities, and that from day to day we were driving out of our midst men who earn their money on these streets and who would be glad to spend it here. We endeavored to show that the fear of the street railway corporations that the completion of a system of rapid transit would diminish their franchises was based upon an error; to show that in London and Paris, where there is a complete railway system, the local traffic by omnibuses and cabs was still a profitable and large business, but all in vain. Rapid transit was postponed and neglected and ignored by the leaders of both parties, and finally, now, in the last days of the session, is strangled at the bidding of men who have no interest but their own to serve and who care little for the benefit of the people if they can make money out of their misfortunes.

We repeat, therefore, that the defeat of rapid transit is to stamp upon the brow of the men who voted against it the stigma of corruption. At the same time we think that the responsibility falls largely upon Governor Tilden and Mr. Kelly. We know that the Mayor has written an earnest letter and has undoubtedly done his part. But the other gentlemen held in their hands the democratic party. They control its organization and they had the power to compel the passage of a just and wise measure of rapid transit. They have neglected their opportunity. Governor Tilden has been too anxious about the Presidency, and has been too deeply immersed in schemes of elaborate statesmanship. Mr. Kelly has been too much concerned with the petty quarrels about rings and patronage, about the State Committee and the organization of Tammany Hall. So the great duty has been forgotten, neglected and destroyed. The two lessons we learn from it are that under our modern system of legislation in Albany the will of the people is nothing in the presence of a lobby with one hundred thousand dollars in its pocket, and the democratic party, which came into power with so many assurances of reform, is helpless to attain any measure of general welfare and is simply what it was in the past, a machine in the hands of selfish and trading politicians.

WOULD IT NOT BE WELL for District Attorney Bayley, of Albany, to investigate before the Grand Jury the truth of the reports in circulation at Albany to the effect that owners of certain railway interests have taken their own way of defeating rapid transit in New York?

A CORRESPONDENT, who evidently has some information which he is not willing to divulge at present, asks us if we know whether any member of the Senate or Assembly, or any partner or relative of such member has been retained or employed as attorney or counsel for any railroad interest this winter, and if so, whether such member has voted for or against rapid transit in the Legislature? We have no information, but ask the question, and we really wish it were in our power to answer it.

THE CINCINNATI SOCIETY held a triennial convention yesterday in Delmonico's, under the presidency of Hamilton Fish. This society is ninety-two years old and is composed of lineal descendants of the officers of the Revolution. We do not know whether the descendants of the common soldiers are admitted. The society is a pleasant remembrance of the Revolution.

SENATORS and Assemblymen in Albany should remember that rapid transit is demanded by the people. How much better the love of the people than the gold of the lobby!

In Statu Quo.

Very few compensations are connected with this slow moving and slimy trial in Brooklyn. It has grown to be tedious and unprofitable. Not even the single merit of profound sensationalism is left, and its wearying length has surfeited the public appetite for that peculiar kind of news. Even the admirers of the two contestants—those of the Apollo, who sees his hundred thousand dollars' damages retreating to a dim distance from which it is hardly visible to the naked eye, and those of the jocose Jove, who seems to be able to throw a smile into the very grave of a vast reputation—are turning away from the heaped and daily dish of scandal with something like disgust. The general interest in the matter has perceptibly waned within the last few weeks. Of course everybody wanted to take a single look at the distinguished dead to find out whether the features were those of Tilton or Beecher; but the truth is the weather is getting warm and it will be just as well to have the funeral at as early an hour as can be made convenient.

This great trial has been chiefly remarkable as a series of surprises and disappointments, and if the jury should happen to disagree at the end of the conflict we might not be exactly surprised, because we have been taught in the progress of affairs that we should be surprised at nothing; but our disappointment would reach a climax. If the trial shall thoroughly vindicate the honor of either party, and put his innocence beyond a peradventure, it will, perhaps, compensate for the subtle and far-reaching demoralization it has caused. But if it results in Tilton's swearing that Beecher did and Beecher's swearing that he didn't, then we are and have been walking knee-deep in moral filth for no purpose whatever.

First, we were disappointed in Tilton's revelations. He had thrown out so many dark hints, had shaken his head so wisely, as though he would say, "I could or I would," and had pledged himself so many times to tell secrets horrific enough to cause each particular hair on the universal American cranium to stand on end, that we rather expected when he took the stand to hear from his parched lips of deeds and purposes bloody enough to eclipse the sun and send every hen on the Continent to its roost, under the impression that night had come. But from the moment when he swore to tell the whole truth, he was taken with a kind of apolepsy, and only reaffirmed the identical story which had been given us in abridged and unabridged editions again and again.

Then came Moulton, who has immortalized friendship. He has made us all feel that it is very desirable to have a third party securely hidden in some unexpected corner, whose business shall be to listen to odd bits of conversation, to take note of any kisses that may be given, and to keep a sharp lookout as to their facial topography—that is, whether they are bestowed on lips or forehead. We were sure that he would sound the depths of the marsh. We were on the very tiptoe of excitement, certain that the walls of Jericho would tumble when he spoke. Day after day passed, but the truth—that will o' the wisp, that artful dodger—was as far off as ever. We were as close to it as Macbeth was to the fabled dagger. We cried in vain, "Come, let me clutch thee!" and were compelled to soliloquize, "I have thee not, and yet I see thee still."

The third and great disappointment occurred when Mr. Beecher himself took the stand. All sorts of rumors were afloat about him. Some thought he would borrow the mutual friend's pistol and end the tragedy with a first class funeral; others believed that the mysterious package of poison which lay untouched on his study table would be called into requisition; others still watched the flush in his cheek and whispered under their breath, apoplexy. Mr. Beecher, however, resorted to none of these expedients. When his name was called he came to the witness stand with a bland smile, as though he had done nothing worse all his life than preach funny sermons. He gave the lie direct to the accusations of the prosecution, and fairly took our breath away at the jocose and pleasant way in which he disposed of the gravest charges. And yet he settled nothing, neither did he bring to the subject a single new ray of light.

The fourth disappointment has been the powerlessness of a severe cross-examination to elicit the truth. That there is the most fearful amount of lying somewhere no one will be bold enough to deny. No ordinary, inconspicuous lies have been told. They are to the level plain of our common life about what the Himalayas are among mountains. They are snow-capped with the sublimity of audacity, and yet they have been so well learned that all the skill of the most acute lawyers has not been able to uncover them to public view. Witnesses have been caught and trapped in slight discrepancies, but no one has been fairly enmeshed and compelled to give up the ghost. This is a great pity. It would have added very materially to the dramatic effect of the trial if some witness had been turned inside out, like an old glove; but that delight has been denied us.

And now we wait impatiently for the end. We are, however, like a traveller on an old-fashioned country road. He expects at every turn to catch a glimpse of the inn, but, alas! only sees the same dusty highway stretching its lazy length in the distance. And yet we have a single ray of hope. It is based on the law of contraries. Since we have been disappointed all along, it is just possible that the trial may end unexpectedly, and so the last disappointment shall be better than the first.

The Mecklenburg Controversy.

We print this morning two new North Carolina letters—one from ex-Governor Vance, maintaining the authenticity of the declaration of May 20; the other a second and supplementary argument of Mr. Daniel R. Goodloe, a distinguished citizen of that State, on the other side of the question. Ex-Governor Vance merely states his points without arguing them; but his letter is valuable as a succinct presentation of the grounds for believing that there was an actual declaration of independence at Charlotte May 20, 1875. We have no doubt that this is the fixed belief of a majority of the people of North Carolina—a belief that has been transmitted from sire to son for a hundred years, and is so entwined with the patriotic sentiment and pride of the State that adverse argument is not likely to eradicate it.

Mr. Goodloe, though his second letter is not long, goes more into specific facts and details with a view to refute the hypothesis that a declaration of independence might have been made on the 20th and its immediate publication suppressed for prudential reasons. Mr. Goodloe's arguments seem strong on their face, but they do not meet all the difficulties. How did it happen that many different persons who were present at the meeting and witnessed the proceedings, but were subsequently scattered to different parts of the State and into other States, testified positively many years afterward to the fact that the paper then produced was a declaration of independence, if it was not so in fact? How did it happen that they, one and all, without any concert or communication with one another, gave the 20th of May, if that was not the true date? According to Dr. Hawks, they made these statements under oath. He says, "No less than seven witnesses of most unexceptionable character swear positively that there was a meeting of the people of Mecklenburg at Charlotte on the 19th and 20th days of May, 1775; that certain resolutions distinctly declaring independence of Great Britain were then and there prepared by a committee, read publicly to the people by Colonel Thomas Polk and adopted by acclamation. These seven swear positively to the date, the 19th and 20th days of May, 1775. In addition, seven others, equally above suspicion, swear that they were present at precisely such a meeting as that described above." There is another difficulty which requires explanation. The undisputed resolutions of May 31 make no allusion to the battle of Lexington, which seems unaccountable if we discredit the previous meeting on the 20th. An event which so electrified and incensed the country would hardly have been omitted from a series of resolutions adopted at a public meeting when the news of it was so fresh, unless the people had expressed their sentiments respecting it on a previous occasion. The resolutions purporting to be of the 20th do express in becoming terms the public sense of indignation at the "inhuman shedding of the blood of American patriots at Lexington." The absence of all allusion to Lexington in the resolutions of May 31 is easily accounted for if there had been a meeting on the 19th and 20th, during which the messenger arrived who brought intelligence of the battle.

As we have repeatedly said before, we prefer to express no decided judgment on the question of these rival dates until the discussion shall have run its course. It is no deviation from this purpose to indicate points on one side or the other which we would like to see more fully handled by the historical critics. There is a host of them in reserve, some of great distinction and ability, whose communications we have preferred to hold until after the North Carolina disputants have had a full hearing. Writers who are without any local bias derived from residence or association may be expected to approach the question in a more judicial temper, and the final summing up will come appropriately from able historical inquirers outside the State.

ACCORDING TO JOSEPHUS it was the law of the Jews and Egyptians that whoever without sufficient cause was found with a mortal poison in his custody was compelled to swallow it. Let the legislators who have defeated rapid transit be forced to swallow the railroad gold which has corrupted them.

OUR New York policemen do not seem inclined to look after the Horseshoe murderer unless there should be some money in it. The police are good business men, and do not waste their time over trifles.

RUSSIA has made another gain in territory, this time from Japan. The Japanese have ceded the Czar a portion of the island of Saghalien. The two Powers which seem to march steadily on in the path of empire and territorial acquisition are Russia and England.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

It was a mild winter in Iceland.

Vice President Wilson left Little Rock yesterday afternoon for St. Louis.

Professor Marsh has really made a rattling among those dry bones.

Rev. John F. W. Ware, of Boston, is sojourning at the Grand Central Hotel.

Judge L. Q. C. Elmer, of New Jersey, is staying at the Westmoreland Hotel.

Mr. John La Farge, the artist, is among the late arrivals at the Everett House.

Colonel John D. Kurtz, United States Army, is quartered at the Hoffman House.

Professor L. H. Atwater, of Princeton College, is registered at the Everett House.

Senator Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, arrived last evening at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.

Rear Admiral Henry K. Thatcher, United States Navy, has apartments at the Windsor Hotel.

Professors William P. Blake and John F. Weir, of Yale College, are stopping at the Albemarle Hotel.

Captain Charles B. Phillips, of the Engineer Corps, United States Army, is at the Metropolitan Hotel.

United States District Judge John T. Nixon, of New Jersey, is residing temporarily at the Everett House.

Commander L. A. Beardslee, United States Navy, has taken up his quarters at the Gilsey House.

Chaplain James J. Kane, of the United States Navy, sailed for Europe yesterday in the Scotia, on sick leave.

The State of Antigua, Central America, offers an asylum to all Sisters of Mercy who may be expelled from other countries.

Judge Joseph P. Bradley, United States Supreme Court, arrived at the Grand National Hotel, Jacksonville, Fla., on the 9th inst.

Congressman William D. Kelley, of Philadelphia, arrived in this city last evening, and took up his residence at the Everett House.

Since Serjeant Ballantyne went to India to defend the Guicowar the native scholars have noted the existence in the Sanscrit of the word "Ballantine," which there signifies "a person of mighty strength."

As they continue to want a hermit at Notre Dame de Pene, in France, it may be worth reflection on the part of Henry Ward whether or no that would not be a good place to go to in case the result of the trial displeases him.

General Schofield is said to have bagged $150,000 on the Big Bonanza. Glad of it. He would make about as good a President as we ever had, and, if the Bonanza story is true, he would not be tempted to sell out by accepting gifts.

France, Austria, Italy, Belgium and Denmark are all in the same boat with regard to Prussia. Each one has a quarrel against her, and each one good reason to apprehend the continuance of Prussian supremacy in Europe. United these Powers can whip Prussia even with Russia behind her.

Mrs. Jane Gray Seaver, a beautiful widow of this city, not unknown to literary fame, was recently married at All Souls' Church, Langham place, London, to Edward A. Crane, editor of the *American Register*, Paris. The bride was given away by Colonel Hoffman, and the American colony was there to see.